UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,300	07/24/2003	William S. Richie JR.	384-1U5 (ITW-8533-63)	1877

570 7590 02/28/2006

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
KITOV, ZEEV	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2836	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,300	RICHIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zeev Kitov	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 9, 58 - 64* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 4, 6, 7, 58, 60, 62 - 64* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5, 8, 9, 59 and 61* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 December 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *07/24/03, 05/20/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 - 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Breidegam et al. (US 4,974,115). Regarding Claim 1, Breidegam et al. disclose following elements: an ionization system for a predefined area including: (a) a plurality of emitter modules spaced around the area (24 and 26 in Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 4 – 20), each emitter module including at least one electrical ionizer (col. 4, lines 4 – 29) and having an individual address (col. 8, lines 45 – 63); (b) a system controller for individually addressing and monitoring the emitter modules (shown in Fig. 4); and (c) inherently includes communication lines for electrically connecting the plurality of emitter modules with the system controller.

Regarding Claim 2, Breidegam et al. disclose each of the emitter modules including equivalent means for transmitting alarm condition information related to at least one operating parameter of the electrical ionizer via the communication lines (col. 7, lines 17 – 30); the alarm condition information including the emitter module address, the system controller receiving the alarm condition information.

Regarding Claims 3 and 4, Breidegam et al. disclose the operating parameter as the status of a positive or negative emitter including an ion balance conditions (col. 7, lines 17 – 30).

Regarding Claims 6, Breidegam et al. disclose each monitored element (emitter module) having a stored reference value, i.e. balance reference value (col. 7, lines 31 – 45, col. 8, lines 9 - 58), and the system controller including equivalent means for individually monitoring the stored balance reference value of each emitter module (col. 8, lines 9 – 58).

Regarding Claim 7, Breidegam et al. disclose each emitter module having a stored ion output current reference value, i.e. alarm limits (threshold) (col. 7, lines 17 – 30). It further discloses monitoring the ion output current reference values (col. 7, line 47 – col. 8, line 48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 58, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breidegam et al. in view of Hoigaard (US 5,083,117). Regarding Claims 58, 63 and 64, Breidegam et al. disclose a plurality of emitter modules spaced around the area, each emitter module has an ionizer (24 and 26 in Fig. 1) and inherently has an

individual address. It further discloses individually adjusting at least one operational setting of the emitter module, i.e. ion balance. However, it does not disclose a receiver and a transmitter. Hoigaard discloses the system with plurality of remote units each having the receiver and the transmitter (704 and 702 in Fig. 7). It further discloses the remote controller having an emitter address setting and a transmitter, the remote control transmitter individually addressing each of the remote test units to make measurements. Both references have the same problem solving area, namely providing the centrally controlled ESD protected environment in the protected area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Breidegam et al. solution by adding the receiver and the transmitter, because when plurality of objects are digitally controlled and measured by the central computer, use of the digital receiver and digital transmitter is unavoidable. In modern technology such elements represent a standard technical solution.

Regarding Claim 60, Breidegam et al. disclose the output being the pulsed DC (col. 5, lines 59 – 64).

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breidegam et al. in view of Hoigaard and Kumar et al. (US 6,529,119), As was stated above, Breidegam et al. and Hoigaard disclose all the elements of Claim 58. However, regarding Claim 62, they do not disclose emitters communicating by a radio frequency. Kumar et al. disclose the multi-device environment wherein the communication between the central computer and peripheral devices is maintained by the radio frequency

means (Fig. 1 – 3, col. 3, lines 16 – 27). Both references have the same problem solving area, namely providing communication between the central control unit and peripheral devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the Breidegam et al. solution by replacing the hardwire bus by the radio frequency means according to teachings of Kumar et al., because as Kumar et al. state (col.1, lines 22 - 25), the wireless communication bus offers significant advantages by eliminating the physical interconnection between devices.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 8, 9, 59 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeev Kitov whose current telephone number is (571) 272 - 2052. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 – 4:30. If attempts to reach examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (571) 272 – 2800, Ext. 36. The fax phone number for organization where this application or proceedings is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for all communications.

BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800